

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
SAVANNAH DIVISION

LESLIE DANIEL ALEXANDER,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) Case No. CV410-270
)
VADEN NISSAN)
)
Defendant.)

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On October 20, 2011, the Court entered an order denying plaintiff's request for a hearing. (Doc. 10.) The docket reflects that a service copy of the order was mailed to Alexander at the address he provided. The order was returned as undeliverable on October 31, 2011. (Doc. 11.)

Plaintiff has neglected to provide the Court with a current mailing address. Local Rule 11.1 places a continuing duty on *pro se* litigants to keep the Court apprised of their current address. Without a litigant's current mailing address, the Court cannot move the case forward or even

communicate with plaintiff.¹

A court has the power to prune from its docket those cases that amount to no more than mere deadwood. Accordingly, plaintiff's complaint should be **DISMISSED** without prejudice for his failure to prosecute this action. S.D. Ga. LR 41(b); *see Link v. Wabash Railroad Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630–31 (1962) (courts have the inherent authority to dismiss claims for lack of prosecution); *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-op*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989); *Jones v. Graham*, 709 F.2d 1457, 1458 (11th Cir. 1983); *Floyd v. United States*, No. CV491-277 (S.D. Ga. June 10, 1992).

SO REPORTED AND RECOMMENDED this 1st day of

November, 2011.



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

¹ As court policy does not allow pro se litigants to utilize electronic filing, they may only be served by mail. Administrative Procedures for Filing, Signing, and Verifying Pleadings and Papers by Electronic Means § III(B), *available at* <http://www.gasd.uscourts.gov/pdf/EcfProcedures.pdf> (last visited November 1, 2011).